

REMARKS

This paper is responsive to Non-Final Office Action dated December 18, 2003. Claims 1-36 were examined. Claims 1-5, 8-16, 31, 32, 35, and 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,218,602 to Grant et al. Claims 17, 33, and 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grant in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,553,027 to Lam et al. Claims 18, 19, 22, 27 and 30-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grant in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,122,274 to Kumar. Claims 23 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grant and Kumar and further in view of Lam.

Art Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a)

Claims 1-5, 8-16, 31, 32, 35, and 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Grant et al. Regarding claim 1, Applicants have incorporated into claim 1 limitations of claims 3 and 6 that Applicants believe distinguish claim 1 from the teachings of Grant and other references of record. As currently amended, Applicants respectfully maintain that Grant, alone or in combination with other references of record, fails to teach or suggest that

for a particular transfer, the arbitration logic is coupled to receive an indication from a particular target node for the particular transfer as to whether the particular transfer can be supported in the particular target node,

as recited in amended claim 1. For at least this reason amended claim 1 is allowable over the art of record. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 1 and all claims dependent thereon, be withdrawn.

Applicants have incorporated into claim 18 limitations of claims 19 and 20 that Applicants believe distinguish claim 18 from the teachings of Grant and other references of record. As currently amended, Applicants respectfully maintain that Grant, alone or in combination with other references of record, fails to teach or suggest

the arbitration logic communicating with the target node to determine if the target node can accept a packet from the initiator node,

as recited by amended claim 18. For at least this reason amended claim 18 is allowable over the art of record. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 18 and all claims dependent thereon, be withdrawn.

Applicants have incorporated into claim 31 limitations that Applicants believe distinguish claim 31 from the teachings of Grant and other references of record. As currently amended, Applicants respectfully maintain that Grant, alone or in combination with other references of record, fails to teach or suggest that

during the arbitration stage, an initiator node requests a path through the network a target node and arbitration logic communicates with a target node to determine if the target node can accept a packet from an initiator node,

as recited by amended claim 31. For at least this reason amended claim 31 is allowable over the art of record. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 31 and all claims dependent thereon, be withdrawn.

Claim 37 has been added and is believed allowable over the art of record. In particular, Applicants respectfully maintain that the art of record fails to teach or suggest

means for communicating with the target node during an individual one of the pipeline stages to determine if the target node can accept a packet from the initiator node,

as recited by new claim 37. For at least this reason amended claim 37 is allowable over the art of record. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 37 and all claims dependent thereon, be withdrawn.

Art Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Applicants respectfully maintain that claims 17, 18, 19, 22-24, 27, 30, 32-36 depend from allowable claims and are allowable for at least this reason. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 17, 18, 19, 22-24, 27, 30, 32-36 be withdrawn.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants appreciate the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 6, 7, 20, 21, 25, 26, 28, and 29. Claim 7 has been put in independent form.

In summary, claims 1-37 are in the case. Claims 1, 3, 6, 7, 18-20 and 31 are amended. Claim 37 is added. All claims are believed to be allowable over the art of record, and a Notice of Allowance to that effect is respectfully solicited. Nonetheless, if any issues remain that could be more efficiently handled by telephone, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at the number listed below.

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that, on the date shown below, this correspondence is being

- ☒ deposited with the US Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.
- ☐ facsimile transmitted to the US Patent and Trademark Office.


Nicole Teitler Cave

3/18/04
Date

Respectfully submitted,



Nicole Teitler Cave, Reg. No. 54,021
Attorney for Applicant(s)
(512) 338-6315
(512) 338-6301 (fax)

EXPRESS MAIL LABEL: _____